



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/608,402	06/30/2000	Ernie F. Brickell	10559-225001	9862

20985 7590 08/26/2003

FISH & RICHARDSON, PC  
4350 LA JOLLA VILLAGE DRIVE  
SUITE 500  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92122

EXAMINER

GREENE, DANIEL L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3621

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/608,402

Applicant(s)

BRICKELL ET AL.

Examiner

Daniel L. Greene

Art Unit

3621

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

THE REPLY FILED 15 August 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☒ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**JAMES R. TRAMMELL**  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant argues that Anderson '202 identifies an account rather than a user's identity and then states that a central authorization service tracks the usage of digital credentials. Anderson '202 teaches about the use of electronic signatures and other means of account request usage verification. However, any type of information conveyed between computers is by definition in digital form and credentials is a string of bits formulated to be used for security methods. It appears to the Examiner that the Applicant is directing his Application toward the use of number formats as opposed to user's identities because there is a lack of user identity methods such as biometrics techniques. The Applicant further argues that neither Anderson '202 and Vance '526 demonstrate any type of record keeping and reporting there of. Anderson '202 teaches about electronic checks and banking, mortgage applications, medical records, prescriptions, contracts, and the like that satisfy existing customs, protocols and legal rules. Each of these endeavors have their own set of record keeping rules and regulations that meet and exceed the Applicant's contention that neither one demonstrate any type of record keeping. In reference arguing against a reference, one cannot show non-obviousness by attacking the references individually where the rejection is based on a combination of references. In re Young, 159 USPQ 725 (CCPA 1968). Also, a reference is to be considered not only for what it expressly states, but for what it would reasonably have suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art. In re DeLisle, 160 USPQ 806 (CCPA 1969).